

REMARKS

Applicant has reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on August 9, 2006, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 1, 11, 13, and 14 are amended, claims 2-9, and 12 are canceled, and no claims are added; as a result, claims 1, 10, 11, and 13-30 are now pending in this application, of which claims 17-30 are withdrawn.

35 USC §102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Henry, Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 6,832,075). Claims 2-7 are canceled rendering this rejection moot with respect to those claims. Claim 1 has been amended to recite additional subject matter. Applicants respectfully submit that Henry does not disclose, teach, or suggest the subject matter of claim 1 as amended, including for example, “a plurality of loopback circuits to couple the transmitter to the receiver of each integrated circuit, wherein the plurality of loopback circuits are situated on the semiconductor wafer and off the plurality of integrated circuits.”

Further, applicants respectfully submit that the subject matter of claim 1 is not obvious in view of the applied references. None of the applied references include loopback circuits on a semiconductor wafer in a manner that allow calibration of receiver circuits as claimed in claim 1. Further, none of the applied references suggests putting a plurality of loopback circuits on the semiconductor wafer and off the plurality of integrated circuits. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

35 USC §103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 8-16 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henry, Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 6,832,075) in view of Haycock (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0024477) and further in view of Wei et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0234010). Claims 8, 9, and 12 have been canceled, rendering this rejection moot with respect to those claims. Claim 10 depends on claim 1, which is believed to be in condition for allowance (see above). Accordingly, claim 10 is believed to be in condition for allowance at least by virtue of dependency.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection with respect to claim 11. Applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been presented for the following reasons.

The Wei reference is disqualified as prior art under 35 USC § 103(c)

The Wei reference qualifies as prior art only under 35 USC § 102(e). The instant application and the Wei reference were, at the time the invention of the instant application was made, owned by Intel Corporation. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that the Wei reference is disqualified as prior art 35 USC § 103(c). Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

The combination of references does not teach the subject matter of claim 11.

Henry discloses a “calibration system [in which a] mobile phone 10 is operatively connected to an equipment rack 51 and to a loopback module 60. The loopback module 60 is operatively connected to the equipment rack 51.” See column 4 line 67 to column 5 line 3 of Henry.

Haycock discloses varying a frequency response of a pre-emphasis unit to match characteristics of a transmission line. See the abstract of Haycock.

Wei discloses a method to calibrate a variable offset comparator by shorting input terminals. See paragraph 34 of Wei.

Claim 11 as filed recites a transmitter with a pre-emphasis circuit, a receiver with a variable offset comparator, and a loopback circuit *all on an integrated circuit*. Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Henry, Haycock, and Wei do not disclose the loopback of signals produced by a pre-emphasis circuit to calibrate a variable offset comparator. In contrast, the calibration system of Henry includes an “equipment rack” and a “loopback module.”

The above traversal notwithstanding, independent claim 11 has been amended to include additional limitations. Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references, taken alone or in any combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest the subject matter of claim 11 as amended, including for example, “a control mechanism to calibrate the receiver circuit by causing the

transmitter circuit to drive a plurality of substantially constant signal levels, causing the loopback circuit to provide the plurality of substantially constant amplitude signals to the receiver circuit, and to cause the receiver circuit to measure offsets.”

Claims 13-16 are believed to be in condition for allowance at least by virtue of dependency.

Reservation of Rights

Applicants do not admit that references cited under 35 USC §§ 102(a), 102(e), 103/102(a), or 103/102(e) are prior art, and reserve the right to swear behind them at a later date. Arguments presented to distinguish such references should not be construed as admissions that the references are prior art.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (952-473-8800) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

BRYAN K. CASPER ET AL.

By their Representatives,

Customer Number: 45445

Telephone Number: 952-473-8800

Date November 9, 2006

By Dana B. LeMoine
Dana B. LeMoine
Reg. No. 40,062

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 9 day of November, 2006.

Jenny Hollingsworth

Name

[Signature]
Signature